

Date: Wed, 5 May 93 04:30:25 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #127
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 5 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 127

Today's Topics:

 Chicago scanner law
 MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS) (3 msgs)
 sick of it all

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 4 May 93 13:21:54 GMT
From: pacbell.com!att-out!walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Chicago scanner law
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

This was posted in the alt.radio.scanner newsgroup. Does anyone in
the amateur newsgroups have any details on this proposed ordinance?
Might the ordinance affect the use of any type of mobile
radios by amateurs? If thie "proposed" ordinance only impacts
use of a radio during the commission of a crime, there's probably no
problem, but if it forbids anyone from using radios in certain
legal situations (e.g. mobile use), then it should be opposed
or the language of the ordinance should be changed BEFORE it
becomes law.

The other post follows my sig (please direct all replies to
rec.radio.amateur.policy only.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

In article <1993Apr29.173002.10834@tellab5.tellabs.com> jwa@tellabs.com (John W. Albert) writes:

>This morning (4-29-93) on WGN (720 AM in Chicago), the "Bob
>Collins Show" was talking about an ordinance that the Chicago
>City Council is trying to pass.
>
>The purpose is to make it illegal for anyone, especially criminals,
>to possess police scanners and to prevent them from monitoring
>the police.
>
>Of course we all know that most scanner owners are criminals
>and they should be locked up. And if the law is passed, they
>won't drive to a suburb or even to another state to buy a
>scanner. Also, we all know that this law will stop someone
>from owning a scanner and in order to abide by the laws, most
>criminals will turn them in to the authorities.

>
>
>---
> Jack Albert Fellow Radio Buff
> Tele (708) 512-7854
> Tellabs, Inc. FAX (708) 852-7346
> 4951 Indiana Ave. jwa@tellabs.com
> Lisle, IL
> 60532

> Do you have a certain itch that's so private,
> you'll only discuss it with your physician?
>

Date: Tue, 04 May 93 01:25:56 CDT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

andrews@fmsystem.ncoast.org (Andrew Sargent N80FS) writes:

> In article <V9qX3B2w165w@GRAFex.Cupertino.CA.US> ka6etb@GRAFex.Cupertino.CA.U
> >andrews@fmsystem.ncoast.org (Andrew Sargent N80FS) writes:
> >
> >> Let's cut to the chase here...
> >>

> >> Would _somebody_ just post all the MARS frequencies. Let's get this
> >> out into the open, include the CAP frequencies too while your at it.
> >

Civil Air Patrol frequencies can be found in their publication,
CAPM 100-1, which is available to anyone for a nominal fee from
National Headquarters, Civil Air Patrol, Maxwell AFB, Alabama 36112.

Generally, they operate on several frequencies in the 4400-4700 KHz
range, on 26.620 MHz, and on 148.15 MHz. If any of these are in use
in your area, you will find the operations pseudo-military in nature,
of little value outside the organization, and most likely boring to
the average public safety monitor.

Hope this helps.

-Robert

Date: Tue, 04 May 93 12:37:42 GMT
From: netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!atlas.la.locus.com!
dana@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C6ExCr.6p2@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)
writes:

>dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>:
>: If you want to communicate on ham radio, you have to use clear text.
>: That doesn't mean you cannot arrange with someone to speak in private.
> According to your interpretation if someone tells another ham to
>"call me at home" would they have to be willing to give their phone number
>out over the repeater if someone asked? If not, how does this differ from
>giving out a rrepeater freq? I always thought that codes and ciphers were
>meant to obscure content not meaning.

As I've been pointing out all along, if the intent is to obscure the
meaning of the traffic, 97.113(d) prohibits the use of a code or
cipher. If Joe said "Let's meet on MARS Packet", the meaning is
clear and not encoded. If Joe said "Let's meet on MARS packet channel
Foxtrot-Uniform", then he's intentionally obscured the frequency.

The difference is small, and I generally don't care. I do not sit
around monitoring for rules-breakers and turn them in, but I do
find it interesting to read and understand the rules.

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: 4 May 93 14:56:00 GMT
From: netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!
dana@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <V9qX3B2w165w@GRAFex.Cupertino.CA.US> ka6etb@GRAFex.Cupertino.CA.US
(KA6ETB Steve Harding) writes:

>

>And, in my opinion, saying "I'll meet you on 2P1" is no different than
>saying "I'll meet you on the club repeater".

>

>73 de Steve

It is possible you missed the genesis of this thread. I was told by a MARS
operator that designators are used *on amateur frequencies* to *conceal*
the actual frequencies from non-MARS members.

If you are saying "I'll meet you on 2P1" in an effort to obscure any meaning
of the communication, that is contrary to 97.113(d). It is a matter of intent.
If you are not using the designator "2P1" to obscure meaning of the
communication, you will be happy to explain what it means on the air. If
you are not willing to explain what "2P1" means on the air because you don't
want people to know what it means, then you *are* using a code.

How can it be simpler?

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Tue, 4 May 1993 16:37:41 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!cbnewsm!
jeffj@decwrl.dec.com

Subject: sick of it all
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May3.231537.11520@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>hlester@as.arizona.edu (Howard Lester) writes:

>

>I think it's been stated pretty clearly what's "wanted". Make the
>licensing requirements relevant and related to the privileges granted.
>Granting access to portions of the phone bands to someone because they can
>copy 20 WPM instead of 13 WPM or 13 WPM instead of 5 WPM seems a bit
>bizarre. In addition I think most have "wanted" the written exams
>substantially beefed up.

I have to agree with this. I have always thought the current licensing and testing structure to be somewhat bizarre. We should have 3 classes of license and one code test to adhere to International treaties. The written tests should be much more involved. I saw the English study manual and it is much harder than what we have here. However, once you study that and pass the tests. You will know radios and antennas inside and out! That's what we should have. If someone wants to ragchew and shoot skip, that's what CB is for, if someone wants to take a step up and get in a hobby that is technically widespread and involved, that is what Amateur Radio is for. When someone has to work his tail off to get something he usually takes it a lot more seriously and that is probably what has caused the Nocode debate to go on endlessly! CW is not easy to learn if you don't work at it. It is a MAJOR part of Amateur Radio no matter how much the anti-code guys would like it not to be. It shouldn't be a criteria for extra phone privileges but it has kept Amateur Radio from being like CB. 73!

Jeff

--

Jeff Jones	AB6MB		OPPOSE THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT!
jeffj@seeker.mystic.com			Canada/USA Free Trade cost Canada 400,000 jobs.
Infocline BBS	415-778-5929		Want to guess how many we'll lose to Mexico?

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #127
